

UNPUBLISHED

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

No. 04-2513

ELIZABETH MASON FROTHINGHAM,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

versus

DONALD H. RUMSFELD, in his official capacity as Secretary of the United States of America; CARL W.S. CHUN, in his official capacity as Director of the Army Board for Correction of Military Records for the United States Army; PETER SCHOOMAKER, in his official capacity as Chief of Staff for the United States Army; LES BROWNLEE, in his official capacity as Acting Secretary for the United States Army; THOMAS J. ROMIG, in his official capacity as Judge Advocate for the United States Army; STEVEN MORELLO, in his official capacity as General Counsel for the United States Army; PAUL T. MIKOLASHEK, in his official capacity as Inspector General for the United States Army,

Defendants - Appellees.

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Virginia, at Alexandria. Gerald Bruce Lee, District Judge. (CA-04-82-1)

Submitted: April 27, 2005

Decided: May 19, 2005

Before MOTZ, KING, and DUNCAN, Circuit Judges.

Affirmed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

Elizabeth Mason Frothingham, Appellant Pro Se. Dennis Carl Barghaan, Jr., Assistant United States Attorney, Ralph Andrew Price, Jr., OFFICE OF THE UNITED STATES ATTORNEY, Alexandria, Virginia, for Appellees.

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.
See Local Rule 36(c).

PER CURIAM:

Dr. Elizabeth Frothingham appeals the district court's order granting defendants' motion to dismiss and motion for summary judgment in her civil action in which she alleged constitutional violations and violations of the Administrative Procedure Act in the denial of her claim for benefits under a military pension survivor benefit annuity. We have reviewed the record and find no reversible error. Accordingly, we affirm on the reasoning of the district court. See Frothingham v. Rumsfeld, No. CA-04-82-1 (E.D. Va. Nov. 18, 2004). We also deny Frothingham's motion for oral argument. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the materials before the court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

AFFIRMED